

Application Serial No. 10/595,332
Request for Reconsideration dated September 9, 2010
Response to Office Action dated June 9, 2010

connected to a second terminal if the subscriber status information indicates that the second terminal is able to receive the call, and so on (page 2, line 29 -- page 3, line 29; claims 1 and 2)

In accordance with the invention as defined by the independent claims of the present application, an incoming call is delivered in parallel (that is, at the same time) to several terminals. Before the parallel call delivery, it is determined which of the plurality of terminals is able to receive the call, i.e., can be successfully called.

LaPierre similarly fails to disclose a parallel call delivery to a plurality of terminals. Although the LaPierre system and method enables routing a call wherein a plurality of terminals can be reached under a single universal number, when a calling party dials the universal number, the controlling service control point determines whether the subscriber associated with the dialed number has signed up for the universal number service. Upon that determination, the service control point instructs the calling party to select one of the alternate destinations associated with the subscriber, such as a pager, cellular telephone, facsimile machine, etc. In response to receiving the calling party's input, the service control point obtains the routing information associated with the chosen destination and instructs the controlling service switching point to route the call to the selected destination. In other words, after dialing the universal number the calling party must select a specific destination associated with that number.

Bartholomew was cited against claim 6, but Bartholomew also fails to disclose call delivery in parallel to a plurality of terminals in accordance with the subject matter set forth in claim 6.

The Tom reference was cited against claim 7 in addition to Immonen and LaPierre. Tom not only fails to disclose call delivery in parallel to a plurality of terminals but also fails to teach the step of synchronizing the mobility/profile data bases of different identification chips used on different terminals. Tom teaches one terminal having two identification cards (SIM cards).

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that independent claims 1, 6 and 7 would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the cited references because the references, even when combined, fail to disclose the subject matter set forth in the claims. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for the same reasons.

Application Serial No. 10/595,332
Request for Reconsideration dated September 9, 2010
Response to Office Action dated June 9, 2010

Although it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance, if the Examiner believes that further issues remain or has suggestions regarding further amendment of the claims, it is requested that he telephone the undersigned at 260-460-1692.

In the event Applicants have overlooked the need for an extension of time, payment of fee, or additional payment of fee, Applicants hereby petition therefor and authorize that any charges be made to Deposit Account No. 02-0385, Baker & Daniels.

Respectfully submitted,

John F. Hoffman
Registration No. 26,280

Attorney for Applicants

JFH/nw

BAKER & DANIELS LLP
111 East Wayne Street, Suite 800
Fort Wayne, IN 46802
Telephone: 260-424-8000
Facsimile: 260-460-1700

Enc. Return Postcard

CERTIFICATION OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on: September 9, 2010

JOHN F. HOFFMAN, REG. NO. 26,280
Name of Registered Representative

Signature

September 9, 2010
Date